

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the title and claims 9, 11, 15 and 22 are amended. The features added to claims 9 and 11 also are recited in claim 13. Claims 15 and 22 are amended in view of the Examiner's helpful comments contained in the paragraph spanning pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendments.

The Office Action objected to the title. Applicants submit that the amended title overcomes the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 15 and 22 are objected to. These claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion noted above. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 1, 7, 10, 12-15, 17-22, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP-A-8-69684 (Chatani) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,001 to Berstis. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Chatani nor Berstis discloses or suggests an arrangement, as recited in independent claims 1 and 10, in which a controller controls the transmission of the digital images from the digital camera and the charging of the digital camera battery so that the charging and the transmission do not occur at the same time. The Office Action refers to Fig. 3 and paragraphs 19 and 23-29 of Chatani as allegedly disclosing this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree. Fig. 3 is merely a flowchart and does not indicate when the transmission of data ends. Thus, Fig. 3 does not unequivocally or inherently teach that the charging of the battery starts after the transmission of digital image data is completed. Furthermore, paragraph 24 of Chatani discloses that while the digital image data is being transmitted and the transfer state is displayed, the battery begins to be charged "at this time." Thus, Chatani, contrary to explicitly teaching that the data

transmission and battery charging occur at different times, discloses that those functions overlap (they are in coincidence or "at this [same] time").

Accordingly, Chatani does not disclose all features recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Berstis does not account for this deficiency in Chatani, and Berstis is not relied upon for this feature in the Office Action. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 10, along with their dependent claims, are patentable over Chatani and Berstis. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 9, 11, 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of Berstis, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,460 to Takahashi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 9 and 11 now recite that the controller automatically starts charging of a battery of the digital camera through the docking station after the transmission of the digital images is stopped. For the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 10, neither Chatani nor Berstis discloses or suggests this feature. As noted above, Chatani discloses that battery charging is started at the time when data transmission is occurring. Takahashi et al. does not overcome the deficiencies in Chatani. Accordingly, independent claims 9 and 11, along with their dependent claims 25 and 27, are patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of Berstis, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,602,458 to Dowe. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the references applied against claim 5, and further in view of Takahashi et al. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of Berstis, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,844,400 to Ramsier et al. Claims 16 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chatani in view of Berstis, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,135,809 to Asakawa. These rejections are respectfully traversed. These claims

are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to their corresponding independent claims 1 and 10. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: October 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461